

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 remain pending. Claims 1-66 are rejected. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 and 61 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the Claim Amendments.

Claim Objection

Claim 61 is objected to because of an informality. Applicants have corrected the informality. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 61 is moot.

35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 1-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Bach et al. (WO 95/15665), hereinafter referred to as the "Bach" reference. Applicants has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-66 are not anticipated by Bach for the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

In a server, a method of data session handoff, said method comprising:
receiving data from a data source;
transcoding said data according to at least one characteristic of an electronic device;
transmitting at least a portion of said data to an electronic device located in a first location;
receiving notification that said electronic device is moving toward a second location served by a second server;
transmitting a first message to said second server notifying said second server that said electronic device is moving toward said second location;
receiving a second message from said second server that said second server is prepared to communicate with said electronic device;
and

said server stopping transmission of said data.

Independent Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 and 61 recite similar limitations. Claims 2-10 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-20 that depend from independent Claim 11, Claims 22-30 that depend from independent Claim 21, Claims 32-40 that depend from independent Claim 31, Claims 42-50 that depend from independent Claim 41, Claims 52-60 that depend from independent Claim 51, and Claims 62-66 that depend from independent Claim 61 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Bach and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Bach to teach a transcoder/selection entity which exchanges speech information with voice coded devices. Moreover, Applicants understand Bach to teach a transcoder/selection entity which eliminates copies of frames of voice traffic information. Furthermore, Applicants understand Bach to teach a transcoder/selection entity that notifies vocoders of bad or missing frames or duplicate frames for simultaneous transmission to multiple BTS. In other words, Applicants understand Bach to teach and anticipate a transcoder which converts from one format to another. That is, Applicant understands Bach to anticipate conversion between very distinct kinds of data, such as from speech into text or from analog video into digital frames.

In contrast, Applicants respectfully assert that Bach does not anticipate, describe or suggest “transcoding said data according to at least one characteristic of a viewing device,” as claimed (emphasis added). Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit the “transcoding said data according to at least one characteristic of a viewing device” words of the claim must be given their plain meaning. In other words, they must be read as they would be interpreted by those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Sneed, 710 F.2d

1544, 218 USPQ 385 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Moreover, the transcoding said data terminology is clearly defined in the Specification.

For example, on page 1 lines 15-25 of the Specification, transcoding is clearly defined as adapting streaming media data for viewing in different formats by adjusting the screen size output and adjusting the bandwidth. Essentially, transcoding adjusts the streaming media according to the characteristics of the viewing device. For example, Digital Video Disc (DVD) quality MPEG-2 data intended for DVD display may be displayed on a small mobile electronic device by reducing the screen size and the bandwidth to account for the viewing characteristics of the electronic device.

Examiner asserts that Figures 1-4 of Bach are transcoder devices. Applicants are unable to locate any teaching in Bach that suggests any transcoding of said data as clearly claimed and defined in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Bach does not teach, describe or suggest “transcoding said data” as recited in independent Claim 1, and the similar limitations as recited in independent Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 and 61.

Furthermore, Examiner asserts that Figures 1-4 of Bach anticipate servers. Applicants have reviewed the Bach reference, and unable to locate any teaching in Bach that suggests that any transcoder as a server (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Bach does not anticipate a “server” or a “second server” as recited in independent Claim 1, and the similar limitations as recited in independent Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 and 61.

In addition, with regard to Claims 3, 13, 23, 33, 43, 53 and 63, Applicants have reviewed the Bach reference, and are unable to locate any teaching that anticipates a

content server, as asserted by the Examiner. The Examiner has stated that the content server is anticipated by 112 and 122 of Bach. Applicants have reviewed Bach and understand Bach to teach 112 and 122 as a first communication network switch 112 and a second communication network switch 122 (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Bach does not teach, or anticipate the embodiment recited in Claim 3 of “wherein said data source is a content server,” and the similar limitations as recited in Claims 13, 23, 33, 43, 53 and 63.

Applicants respectfully asserts that nowhere does Bach teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 and 61, that these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are thus in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submits the Bach also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-10 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-20 that depend from independent Claim 11, Claims 22-30 that depend from independent Claim 21, Claims 32-40 that depend from independent Claim 31, Claims 42-50 that depend from independent Claim 41, Claims 52-60 that depend from independent Claim 51, and Claims 62-66 that depend from independent Claim 61. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-30, 32-40, 42-50, 52-60, and 62-66 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully asserts that Claims 1-66 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 10/27, 2006


John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (831) 763-2895